## Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed March 29, 2007.

### I.     Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed March 29, 2007, Claims 1-20 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as reading on both statutory and non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-8, 10, 16, 17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Li et al. (US 7,035,435 B2) (hereinafter "Li"). Claims 13-15 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li as applied to claims 1-8, 10, 16, 17, 19 and 20, and further in view of Bhagavath et al. (US 6,829,781 B1) (hereinafter "Bhagavath"). Claims 9, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li as applied to claims 1-8, 10, 16, 17, 19 and 20.

### II.     Summary of Applicant's Amendments

The present Reply cancels Claim 5; amend Claims 1, 10, 19 and 20; all as shown above. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

### III.     Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101

In the Office Action mailed March 29, 2007, Claim 20 was rejected under under 35 U.S.C. 101 as reading on both statutory and non-statutory subject matter. Claim 20 has been amended. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 20, as amended, does not read on non-statutory subject matter, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### IV.     Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-8, 10, 16, 17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Li.

# Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended by the current Reply to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

> 1.      *A method for automatically generating a multi-level video summary, comprising:*
>         *automatically dividing a video file into full motion video segments using segmenting criteria;*
>         *automatically generating at least two summary levels, wherein each of the summary levels has a different level of detail for related video segments and each of the summary levels is a linear full motion video which includes at least one of the video segments from the video file, the video segments in each of the summary levels selected using selection criteria; and*
>         *automatically generating navigational links between the video segments in the summary levels, the navigational links connecting the video segments containing related material.*

Claim 1, as currently amended, defines a method for automatically generating a multi-level video summary. This method generally comprises: automatically dividing a video file into full motion video segments using segmenting criteria; automatically generating at least two summary levels, each of the summary levels having a different level of detail for related video segments, each summary level being a linear video which is selected using a selection criteria; and automatically generating navigational links to link the related video segments.

Li relates to a scalable video summarization and navigation system and method. The method to summarize videos in Li appears to include a method of assigning importance values to scenes, shots and frames within a video. Once the importance values are assigned to the various scenes, shots and frames within a video, *keyframes* are obtained from the video to summarize the video. The summary appears to have *one summary level* which can shortened or lengthened by the user. The summary level is presented to the user as a collection of *nonmoving still frames*.

Applicant's invention embodied in Claim 1 is not anticipated by Li, among other things, for the following reasons. The method of summarizing videos found in Li appears to involve using keyframes (or still frames) to summarize the source video. Applicant's invention, on the other hand, includes a method to summarize the source video using full motion video segments. Additionally, the summary level found in Li appears to be comprised of a collection of nonmoving still frames. Applicant's summary levels are linear full motion videos which can be played by the user. Finally, while Li does discuss the use of "hierarchy levels" (e.g., scenes, shots, and frames) when

-7-

summarizing videos, only *one* summary level is *automatically* created by the Li process, that summary level being a collection of keyframes. The summary created by the Li process may be allowed to "grow or shrink" based on the user's instructions (i.e. keyframes can be split up into further keyframes of greater detail based on the user's instructions), however, Li does not appear to discuss any method of automatically creating multiple summary levels, nor does Li discuss any method of navigating *between* automatically generated *summary levels* of different lengths when summarizing a video. Accordingly, Applicant's method for automatically generating a multi-level video summary is not disclosed in Li, and is therefore not anticipated by Li.

Additionally, while not specifically addressed in the rejection to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiment defined by Claim 1 is also not rendered obvious by Li, in view of Bhagavath et al (US 6,829,781 B1) (hereinafter "Bhagavath"). Bhagavath discloses a network-based service to provide on-demand video summaries of television programs. More specifically, it describes a system for navigating between a single level video summary and the source video. Bhagavath appears to assume the existence of metadata within the source video and the summaries, namely that the broadcasters will provide both the content of the source video and the summary with indexes and tags that already include encoded links.

Applicant's invention embodied in Claim 1, describes a method to *automatically create video summaries as well as automatically create links* between the summary and the source video. This ability to create summaries and the links between the summaries are not disclosed in Bhagavath. Bhagavath also fails to disclose any method that could be used to automatically create *multiple summary levels*, or any method to create links between those summary levels. Thus, neither Li nor Bhagavath, alone or in combination, disclose Applicant's invention embodied in Claim 1.

In view of the comments provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiment defined by Claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited reference, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.


**Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10, 16, and 17**

Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10, 16 and 17 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that these Claims are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also submitted that

these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

**Claims 19 and 20**

Independent Claims 19 and 20 have been amended similar to Claim 1 to more clearly define the embodiment therein and those comments provided for Claim 1 above are incorporated by reference herein. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 19 and 20, as amended, are likewise not anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited reference, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 13-15 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li as applied to claims 1-8, 10, 16, 17, 19 and 20, and further in view of Bhagavath. Claims 9, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li as applied to claims 1-8, 10, 16, 17, 19 and 20.

**Claims 2-4, and 6-18**

It is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the amendments and comments to Claim 1 provided above, which are hereby incorporated by reference. Applicant respectfully submits that these Claims are neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

### V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to

-9-

Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: __June 25, 2007__

By: __/Rex Hwang/__
Rex Hwang
Reg. No. 56206

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800